

updated 30/04/2024

I want to discuss authenticity of two videos showing three misterious orbs circling around an airplane before making a disappearing act.

Original post was made by unknown uploader on undisclosed UFO forum. User RegicideAnon reposted it on Reddit (satelitte - Received: March 12, 2014.; Uploaded May 19, 2014..... dron - Received: June 5, 2014.; Uploaded June 13, 2014..... Source: Protected) specifying that he is not an original uploader.

Links:

<http://web.archive.org/web/20170606182854/https://youtube.com/watch?v=5Ok1A1fSzxY>

<https://web.archive.org/web/20140827060121/https://youtube.com/watch?v=ShapuD290K0>

I can`'t download. I must rely on copies.

Remember 2015 FLIR video showing orb? Beside that one from 2015, there are more videos with misterious orbs, as mentioned at NASA public meeting, appearing in different places from Atlantic ocean to Middle East, but sharing same flying characteristics (super agility, transmedium transition). It adds to credibility of this two videos because orbs are certainly out there. Navy pilot described them as "cube inside sphere". Since these are not high resolution videos justifiable scepticism is welcomed. These videos are obviously cropped. US Navy pilots in 2014. and 2015. have seen such unidentified objects on regular basis. Their comments vary from being surprised seeing the orb, which means they don't have it in their known weapons arsenal, and recognizing them as drones. Hence, it is either military industrial complex or top secret government project about which not even "ordinary" military ranks are informed. Regardless of videos authenticity, there is no proof that orbs belong to any particular country or entity. Without exact proof it is opportune to make precise accusation regarding specific party.

However, we can discuss videos authenticity. Generally speaking, one video is probably recorded by lower orbit satellite (Spy Satellite USA-229) while second by military drone (MQ-1C Gray Eagle) according to Ashton Forbes.

I am not expert in video editing therefore I will make comment on alleged "debunking" made by France24/Observers. If I manage to discredit their discreditation, it will indirectly add value to authenticity, yet still not confirm.

<https://observers.france24.com/en/asia-pacific/20230323-mh370-why-these-two-videos-don-t-show-what-happened-to-the-lost-plane>

FRANCE 24 Observers: "a number of theories began surfacing online", "some of these theories have resurfaced"

My reply: Theories is all we have since there is no official explanation. I don't know why media, not just you, continuously forget to emphasize this important fact.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "several misleading videos... circulating widely on TikTok"

My reply: Original posts were not made at Tik Tok. You are misleading readers.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "two videos... several misleading videos... a closer look at two of them"

My reply: Title of your article says "two videos", then in subtitle you say "several" and then, in same subtitle, you switch back on "two" and that two aren't original but Tik Tok, meaning their comments aren't original. Original videos have no comments other than `Airliner and UFOs` which I have seen multiple times on Wayback machine. You don't even mention Wayback machine videos but constantly refer to irrelevant Tik Tok ones.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "These two videos claiming to show mystery orbs around Malaysia Airlines flight MH370 just before its disappearance (left) or the plane's remains found on Google Earth (right) are false."

My reply: You are again misleading readers. Two videos of orbs have nothing to do with Google Earth.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "claims to show the location"

My reply: two videos of orbs never claim to show the location. Again misleading readers.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "The origin of the video is unrelated to the flight"

My reply: author is making a statement without any substantiation.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "graphic analysis indicates that it was edited"

My reply: Indicate? This is conflicting statement since you earlier wrote "don't show", "misleading"

FRANCE 24 Observers: "a number of aviation experts who accuse it of propagating unfounded conspiracy theories"

My reply: Theories is all we have since there is no official explanation. I don't know why media, not just you, continuously forget to emphasize this important fact. And since when aviation experts have also become experts for conspiracy theories? Two videos showing orbs are allegedly made by satellite and drone not by aviation (aircraft).

FRANCE 24 Observers: "controversial claims include the suggestion"

My reply: You continue to make statements without any substantiation.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "Neither of these explanations is corroborated by the official investigation"

My reply: Official investigation gave no answer to why and how MH370 vanished. Therefore, it has not corroborated respected conspiracy theories.

Now follows part of France 24 article I am not interested in. It is concerned with Google Earth image that has nothing to do with two videos showing orbs. It is misleading to mix it.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "A video posted on TikTok with 1.5 million views... Other TikTok accounts posted another video"

My reply: You are not investigating original videos.

Only after 1/2 of article you start talking about original videos.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "A video on the Internet since 2014 without any mention of flight MH370... the titles of both videos refer to `Airliner and UFOs`. No mention of flight MH370 is made in the captions of either video"

My reply: This is true. MH370 wasn't mentioned but what does that prove? If I post a picture of an apple but not saying in commentary/captions that it is an apple then it is not an apple? Besides, how could those who made that videos know which airplane is presented?

FRANCE 24 Observers: "FRANCE 24 Observers team showed the video to several specialists in UFO videos and online hoaxes. All three were familiar with this video and explain some indications that suggest it is fake... Likely a graphic creation"

My reply: Specialists explain some indications that suggest it is fake. Likely? "Indications", "suggest" and "likely" are not disproving (debunking). It is matter of an opinion.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "a version of the video shared on Vimeo in August 2014 by a UFO enthusiast group. The description under the video describes it as `what the disappearance of Malaysia Airlines flight MH370 may have looked like` made by a `video editing enthusiast`"

My reply: Version from August 2014? Original was posted in March/May 2014 therefore description under Vimeo post has no importance. Why are you investigating derivative publication?

FRANCE 24 Observers: "poor example of editing that wants to profit off the MH370 tragedy"

My reply: first you wrote that "No mention of flight MH370 is made in the captions of either video" and then your expert says "wants to profit off the MH370 tragedy". This two statements are mutually conflicting. Who wants to profit of MH370 if there is no mention of it? Anyway, it is unclear are you discussing "editing" of Tik Tok, Vimeo or Reddit version.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "video mentions AWACs"

My reply: I have watched RegicideAnon video of three orbs circling airplane several times and there is no mention of AWACs.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "direct reference to a theory put forward by journalist... deliberately jammed the communications of flight MH370 to prevent an arms shipment to China"

My reply: You have singled out one theory made by some journalist. Besides sounding shallow, it has nothing to do with original videos posted by RegicideAnon.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "as the TikTok account claims"

My reply: Why are you discussing irrelevant versions of videos and claims made on Tik Tok account?

FRANCE 24 Observers: "Other incoherent details"

My reply: Other? You haven't even touched original videos in your article.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "I downloaded a higher resolution copy of the first video, alleged satellite footage with some letters and numbers half-visible on the screen. I'm pretty sure the video maker wanted viewers to believe the satellite is NROL-33 based on what we can see on that clip. I checked the letters/numbers using 10-20x magnification and went through the footage frame-by-frame... NROL-33 is a real military satellite, but it was launched on May 22, 2014 - later than MH370 incident. So if the video maker wanted viewers to believe the footage is from NROL-33 satellite, it can't be true."

My reply: What are you saying? Your statements are utterly incorrect. That is not 33 but 22. You don't need magnification to see clearly that is not 33.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "the satellite is NROL-33 based on what we can see on that clip. I checked the letters/numbers using 10-20x magnification and went through the footage frame-by-frame... NROL-33 is a real military satellit" (I had to repeat this part because I don't believe you claim it is 33)

My reply: IT IS NOT 33! It can only be 22. You are wrong.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "I think no satellite can't take that kind of images of an airplane"

My reply: Think? Title of your article explicitly states "Why these two videos don't show". It doesn't state that you think why it doesn't show. I call this misleading, too.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "Despite several indications that the video is fake and edited, it's still circulating in 2023."

My reply: What videos are you referring to as fake and edited? Tik Tok ones? Well, those are not original videos meaning you have failed to address proper material.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "narratives surround the video have changed too much to give it any credibility"

My reply: What narratives have changed? Whose narratives have changed? There are no narratives. There are original videos kept on Wayback machine (Internet Archive).

Links:

<http://web.archive.org/web/20170606182854/https://youtube.com/watch?v=5Ok1A1fSzxY>

<https://web.archive.org/web/20140827060121/https://youtube.com/watch?v=ShapuD290K0>

I see no narratives just two videos. Anyone can have personal opinion about them but it doesn't affect the truth that these videos were (are) there. What affect can different opinions have? People say and write all kind of things and what does that have to do with matter itself? If I post photo of myself right this moment and during next years people move that photo from one place to another, change my photo and express negative opinions does that mean that my photo loses credibility?

FRANCE 24 Observers: "Later copies [...] have edited the clip so that the `mystery coordinates` are not visible. I found only one copy where the `coordinates` can be seen. Later copies don't talk about satellite video but suggest it's drone footage."

My reply: Why are you discussing later copies? You dedicate entire article to "later copies". At least, now you admit it. Perhaps you should focus on original videos but you don't know which videos are original because you mingle those made by satellite with those made by drone with those on Tik Tok with those later copies. Regarding original videos for which I have given you links, that are two separate videos showing the same thing. Fact that these two separate videos show the very same thing from different, specific perspective (one from satellite and other from drone) significantly adds to the credibility of both. I haven't seen their mutual comparison.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "MQ1-Predator max altitude is 25,000 ft"

My reply: Where did you get this information? Original drone footage was supposedly made by MQ-1C Gray Eagle which flies at 29,000 ft but since MH370 airplane was flying at lower height than cruising altitude (29,500 ft / 35,000 ft) and descending any of these two drones could have been responsible for recording.

FRANCE 24 Observers: "all these later claims are contradicting the original video caption about satellite video"

My reply: Whose later claims contradict? What satellite caption? There is no caption in original videos it just says "Airliner and UFOs".

FRANCE 24 Observers: "It seems people changed the narrative"

My reply: What people? Can you be a bit more specific? For example, I have written my own article about MH370 unsolved case and now I am writing this reaction to your article. I didn't change my narrative.

My conclusion: your article is fundamentally incorrect. You falsify facts and offer distorted interpretations based on such false premises. I don't know what were your motives for such misdeed. This type of journalism exactly contributes to the fuss instead of helping to resolve MH370 case which is UNSOLVED until today!

FRANCE 24 Observers - your article has been debunked. You have made me believe that there is much more to this story than revealed so far. Now I will continue to investigate MH370 case with even more scrutiny.